

December 10, 2007

**OFFICE OF THE HEARING EXAMINER
KING COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

400 Yesler Way, Room 404
Seattle, Washington 98104
Telephone (206) 296-4660
Facsimile (206) 296-1654
Email: hearex@metrokc.gov

REPORT AND DECISION

SUBJECT: Department of Development and Environmental Services File No. **L06P0017**
Proposed Ordinance No. **2007-0541**

WELLS/RAVENCRAFT
Preliminary Plat Application

Location: 19443 – 143rd Place Southeast, unincorporated Lake Youngs area south
and east of Renton

Applicant: **Seattle Redevelopment, LLC**
Attn: Marc Russo
P.O. Box 2566
Renton, Washington 98056
Telephone: (206) 948-8899

King County: Department of Development and Environmental Services (DDES)
represented by **Chad Tibbits**
900 Oakesdale Avenue Southwest
Renton, Washington 98055
Telephone: (206) 296-7194
Facsimile: (206) 296-7051

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS/DECISION:

Department's Preliminary Recommendation:	Approve subject to conditions
Department's Final Recommendation:	Approve subject to conditions
Examiner's Decision:	Approve subject to revised conditions

EXAMINER PROCEEDINGS:

Hearing Opened:	November 8, 2007
Hearing Closed:	November 8, 2007

Participants at the public hearing and the exhibits offered and entered are listed in the attached minutes.
A verbatim recording of the hearing is available in the office of the King County Hearing Examiner.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS & DECISION: Having reviewed the record in this matter, the Examiner now makes and enters the following:

FINDINGS:

1. General Information:

Applicant:	Seattle Redevelopment, LLC Attn. Marc Russo P.O. Box 2566 Renton, WA 98056 206-948-8899
Engineer:	ESM Consulting Engineers 33915-1 st Way S., #200 Federal Way, WA 98003 253-838-6113
STR:	03-22-05
Location:	The site is located at 19443-143 rd Place SE, unincorporated Lake Youngs area south and east of Renton.
Zoning:	R-6
Acreage:	2.33 acres
Number of Lots:	16
Density:	Approximately 6.86 units per acre
Lot Size:	Approximately 3,600 to 5,700 square feet in size
Proposed Use:	Single Family Detached Dwellings
Sewage Disposal:	Soos Creek Water & Sewer District
Water Supply:	Soos Creek Water & Sewer District
Fire District:	King County Fire District No. 37
School District:	Kent School District No. 415
Application Completeness Date:	December 7, 2006
Associated Applications:	Road Variance L07V0020 Drainage Adjustment L07V0021

2. Except as modified herein, the facts set forth in the DDES reports to the Examiner and the DDES and King County Department of Transportation (KCDOT) testimony are found to be correct and are incorporated herein by reference.
3. The subject property is a rectangularly-shaped parcel 2.33 acres in area, located in the unincorporated Lake Youngs area south and east of Renton. It lies generally south of Southeast 192nd Street and west of 148th Avenue Southeast, at the present northerly stub terminus of 143rd Place Southeast north of its intersection with Southeast 196th Court. The surrounding area is mostly developed with suburban-scale single-family detached residences on individual lots, at a variety of suburban densities, intermingled with some vacant tracts and larger-lot residential tracts. The Lake Youngs Elementary School grounds are located directly adjacent to the southwest.

4. The site is located in the upper Soos Creek sub-basin of the Soos Creek drainage basin. The terrain consists generally of a gentle grade from north to south-southwest. No defined critical areas (and particularly no critical habitat associated with threatened and/or endangered wildlife species, a stated concern of some neighbors; see Finding 11) are present on or nearby the property. The site is vegetated with a moderately dense overstory of mixed-species native trees and typical Pacific Northwest understory. A single-family residence and two outbuildings are developed in the west central portion of the site (and are proposed to be removed with the proposed subdivision development).
5. Applicant Seattle Redevelopment, LLC, proposes subdivision of the property into 16 lots for detached single-family detached dwellings and additional tracts for recreation and drainage facilities, and for private road access tracts to some of the lots. 143rd Place Southeast is proposed to be extended due northward through the middle of the site to form another stub terminus on the north property line for eventual extension and ultimately through connection to an intersection with Southeast 192nd Street. (The county road engineer has granted a road standards variance under file L07V0020 to permit additional lots on the current cul de sac route to the site.) The subdivision development will provide an onsite recreation area which will be conveniently located and accessible to all residents. The proposed development density would be approximately 6.9 units per acre, with lot sizes ranging from approximately 3,600 to 5,700 square feet in area. The proposed density above the base density of the R-6 zone (six units per acre) would be achieved by utilizing the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program authorized under the County's development regulations. [KCC 21A.12.030(A)(B)(1) and Chapter 21A.37 KCC]
6. The proposed density of development and lot sizes conform to the County's development regulations.
 - A. There is discomfort on the part of several participating parties of record with the proposed density, which is felt to present an inappropriate disparity with the surrounding existing residential densities, will inappropriately add more residences and traffic, and will also be of potential adverse impact on surrounding property values. It is also claimed to be unnecessary since the current market for new housing is not favorable. There is no authority under county or state subdivision law or other land use regulations to disallow the density of development proposed based on disparity with existing densities, feared property value decreases or concerns about market absorption.¹
 - B. As noted, the nominal base density of the R-6 zoning applied to the property is six dwelling units per acre. King County Code permits a form of bonus increase of that density over the base to a maximum density of nine dwelling units per acre, predicated

¹ One of the legal premises underlying the land use planning and regulatory system in Washington State is that decisions on individual applications must be based upon adopted ordinances and policies rather than upon the personal preferences or general fears of those who may currently live in the neighborhood of the property under consideration. [*Department of Corrections v. Kennewick*, 86 Wn. App. 521, 937 P.2d 1119 (1997); *Indian Trail Prop. Ass'n. v. Spokane*, 76 Wn. App. 430, 439, 886 P.2d 209 (1994); *Maranatha Mining v. Pierce County*, 59 Wn. App. 795, 805, 801 P.2d. 985 (1990); *Woodcrest Investments v. Skagit County*, 39 Wn. App. 622, 628, 694 P.2d 705 (1985)] The evaluation of the application must therefore be based upon officially adopted county ordinances, plans and policies, and state law, as well as legally accepted principles. And the legislative wisdom of state and county lawmakers must be respected "as is" in deciding the application, since policy decisions are the province of the legislative branch. A quasi-judicial decisionmaker cannot substitute the decisionmaker's judgment for that of the legislative body "with respect to the wisdom and necessity of a regulation." [*Cazzanigi v. General Electric Credit*, 132 Wn. 2d 433, 449, 938 P.2d 819 (1997); *Rental Owners v. Thurston County*, 85 Wn. App. 171, 186-87, 931 P.2d 208 (1997)]

on certain independent threshold factors. One of those optional development factors is the one employed here, the TDR benefit conferred by KCC 21A.12.030(A)(B)(1) in concert with Chapter 21A.37 KCC (the TDR program provisions).

- C. There are no qualitative criteria for use of the TDR program to achieve the additional density: not compatibility, and not neighborhood character issues. This is a classic case of infill density of development within a previously established somewhat lower density residential neighborhood. But it is an inescapable fact that the area is within the Urban Growth Area (UGA), one of the ramifications of the Growth Management Act (GMA). How the density permissibilities and zoning have been decided to implement the GMA is not a matter under the Examiner's authority in deciding the subdivision application. That is a legislative matter under the County Council's domain.
 - D. The adopted County land use regulations unmistakably permit the utilization of the TDR bonus in this case to gain additional density. The Examiner has no discretion to disallow it based on neighborhood dislike (or even to require the property's preservation as open space, as some suggest the county should do). The complaint of the inappropriateness of utilizing the TDR process in this case and the proposed additional density achievable under the applied R-6 zoning is a complaint the Examiner cannot consider.
7. The site's current surface water drainage consists of sheetflow running generally southwest toward the Lake Youngs Elementary School grounds. The development's drainage plan contemplates onsite collection of all development runoff (combining the two onsite drainage subbasins pursuant to DDES-approved drainage adjustment L07V0021) and conveyance to a single underground detention vault in Tract B in the southwest corner of the site. From there it would be released under Conservation flow control standards (pursuant to the 2005 King County Surface Water Drainage Manual; SWDM) and Basic water quality standards to the existing underground pipe drainage system extending southerly in the 143rd Place Southeast right-of-way. The implementation of the proposed drainage plan is feasible of conformance to county drainage regulations and the SWDM, and as implemented would preclude feared development drainage impacts onto certain adjacent private properties. In fact, the preponderance of the evidence in the record indicates that neighboring properties will experience less drainage impact from the subject property upon development than they do currently (it should be noted that there is no evidence of current adverse drainage impacts arising from the site's current sheetflows offsite). The proposed subdivision makes appropriate provisions for drainage.
8. Concerned citizens expressed great discomfort with adding the development's traffic to the internal neighborhood streets, to the east and northeast generally, because of existing conditions of winding streets and some visibility limitations (exacerbated by regularly foggy conditions in the winter time), a situation which is severely aggravated by a high degree of imprudent driving in the area, with frequent speeding and reckless driving which have resulted in some accidents with other vehicles, mail boxes and residential structures, and accounts of other near-misses. Many are genuine concerns, but they cannot be addressed by adding conditions to or denying subdivision approval.
- A. Any unsafe traffic conditions experienced in the neighborhood are due to imprudent driving and cannot ascribed to hazardous road geometry or other physical conditions.
 - B. The lack of sufficient law enforcement response to neighborhood complaints about imprudent driving in the area is unfortunate, but cannot be considered to be a factor in deliberating on the adequacy of the off-site road network for the proposed development.

- C. Inclement weather conditions such as fog and slick roads require driver prudence, the lack of which currently experienced in the neighborhood, again, is a factor which cannot be used to condition or deny the proposed development.
- D. The off-site road system does not contain any defined High Accident Locations (HAL), and the number of trips generated by the proposed development, an estimated 160 average daily trips (ADT), including service vehicle trips (many of which, such as postal, solid waste, recycling, parcel delivery, etc. will already be on the neighborhood's streets), and an estimated ten morning peak hour trips, is not a significant addition to the amount of traffic currently experienced in the neighborhood internal road system.
- E. The level of traffic generated by the proposed development is well under the threshold for level of service (LOS) mitigation. As noted, during the morning peak hour it will add a mere ten trips, one trip for every six minutes on average, seven of which trips will utilize the left turn opportunity at the 146th Avenue Southeast intersection with Southeast 192nd Street, the current most convenient route to common urban destinations from the site. These are *de minimis* (very minor) levels of additional traffic.
- F. A significant aspect of the concerns about the proposed development has to do with its timing in relation to other development proposals for properties to the north, including the adjacent proposed *Carney* subdivision (file L06P0020; now under review prior to public hearing currently scheduled for February 28, 2008), which in their cumulative effect along with the subject proposal will eventually result in full through public road extension of 143rd Place Southeast to Southeast 192nd Street. That routing of development traffic is highly preferred by many neighboring property owners/residents in the area, as it is thought to minimize traffic impacts to the surrounding internal streets in the neighborhood and allow for more immediate emergency vehicle access. An intersection of 143rd Place Southeast at Southeast 192nd Street would also be preferred as a more sight distance-favorable intersection (compared to the current route to Southeast 192nd Street via several roads and then 146th Avenue Southeast; the intersection of 146th Avenue Southeast with Southeast 192nd Street presents some sight distance limitations but not a hazardous traffic situation).
- G. Neighboring and nearby property owners/residents accordingly desire that the development be required to be timed so that it does not occur until after the 143rd Place Southeast through connection to Southeast 192nd Street is completed. There is no authority for the Examiner to impose such a condition on the development, as it involves property held by private entities outside of the applicant's and county's control, county regulations do not go so far as to require the desired sequence of timing in this case, and there are insufficient grounds (among the issues of traffic safety and emergency access) to warrant denial of the proposed subdivision pending such through road connection. (There seems some likelihood that the through road development will occur in close concurrent timing with the proposed development, since as noted the proposed *Carney* subdivision directly to the north is scheduled for public hearing early in 2008, which may spur further efforts to obtain sufficient additional right-of-way for the through construction in generally the same time horizon as the two developments (the subject one and *Carney* to the north).)

9. The preponderance of the evidence in the record demonstrates that the development's traffic impacts will be adequately mitigated under applicable County code requirements, and that appropriate provisions are made for roads.
10. The preponderance of the evidence in the record shows that safe walking conditions will be provided to resident schoolchildren along their anticipated routes to the nearby Lake Youngs Elementary School and to Kenridge High School further to the southwest (on north side of Southeast 208th Street west of 132nd Avenue Southeast) and to the anticipated bus stop(s) for students traveling to Northwood Middle School. (Even with anticipated bus stop relocations that may occur due to shifts in road intersections and student population concentrations, there are a number of adequately safe pedestrian routes to likely bus stop locations in the area.)
11. It has been asserted by neighbors that an owl, species unidentified, lives or has lived on the subject property, but no evidence is presented that it is of a threatened or endangered species, or that the subject property and/or any adjacent surroundings constitute critical wildlife habitat. Given the facts of the case, there is no regulatory authority for regulating or preserving the site on any wildlife habitat grounds. (It is noted that Section 21A.38.230 KCC's tree retention requirements apply to the proposal. A detailed tree retention plan must be submitted with the engineering plans for subdivision construction.)
12. There is also great concern expressed regarding construction period impacts in the neighborhood, particularly the addition of construction vehicle traffic and parking to the neighborhood road system. There is no regulatory bar to such utilization of the public roads of the area. Hours of construction, road maintenance such as cleanup and erosion and dust control are regulated; if any such problems arise during development construction, concerned persons should contact county inspection personnel.

CONCLUSIONS:

1. The proposed subdivision, as conditioned below, would conform to applicable land use controls. In particular, the proposed type of development and overall density are specifically permitted under the R-6 zone and the TDR allowances.
2. If approved subject to the conditions below, the proposed subdivision will make appropriate provisions for the topical items enumerated within RCW 58.17.110, and will serve the public health, safety and welfare, and the public use and interest.
3. The conditions for final plat approval set forth below are reasonable requirements and in the public interest.
4. The dedications of land or easements within and adjacent to the proposed plat, as shown on the revised preliminary plat submitted on September 8, 2006, or as required for final plat approval, are reasonable and necessary as a direct result of the development of this proposed plat, and are proportionate to the impacts of the development.

DECISION:

The preliminary plat of the *Wells/Ravencraft* subdivision, as revised and received September 8, 2006, is approved subject to the following conditions of approval:

1. Compliance with all platting provisions of Title 19A of the King County Code.

2. All persons having an ownership interest in the subject property shall sign on the face of the final plat a dedication that includes the language set forth in King County Council Motion No. 5952.
3. The plat shall comply with the density requirements of the R-6 zone classification. All lots shall meet the minimum dimensional requirements of the R-6 zone classification or shall be shown on the face of the approved preliminary plat, whichever is larger, except that minor revisions to the plat which do not result in substantial changes may be approved at the discretion of the Department of Development and Environment Services.

Any/all plat boundary discrepancy shall be resolved to the satisfaction of DDES prior to the submittal of the final plat documents. As used in this condition, "discrepancy" is a boundary hiatus, an overlapping boundary or a physical appurtenance which indicates an encroachment, lines of possession or a conflict of title.

In order to achieve density over and above the base density allowed by the R-6 zone, the applicant shall provide the TDR Certificate with the submittal of the engineering plans and final plat. If the TDR Certificate cannot be obtained, the applicant shall redesign the number of lots based upon the allowable density. This will result in the reconfiguration and loss of lots.

4. All construction and upgrading of public and private roads shall be done in accordance with the King County Road Standards established and adopted by Ordinance No. 11187, as amended (1993 KCRS).
5. The applicant shall obtain documentation by the King County Fire Protection Engineer certifying compliance with the fire flow standards of Chapter 17.08 KCC.
6. Final plat approval shall require full compliance with the drainage provisions set forth in King County Code 9.04. Compliance may result in reducing the number and/or location of lots as shown on the approved preliminary plat. Preliminary review has identified the following conditions of approval which represent portions of the drainage requirements. All other applicable requirements in K.C.C. 9.04 and the King County Surface Water Design Manual (KCSWDM) must also be satisfied during engineering and final review.
 - a) The drainage facilities shall meet the requirements of the 2005 KCSWDM. The site is subject to the Conservation flow control and Basic water quality requirements of the 2005 KCSWDM.
 - b) A drainage adjustment (L07V0021) is approved for this site. All conditions of approval for this adjustment shall be met prior to approval of the engineering plans.
 - c) To implement the required Best Management Practices (BMP's) for treatment of storm water, the final engineering plans and technical information report (TIR) shall clearly demonstrate compliance with all applicable design standards. The requirements for best management practices are outlined in Chapter 5 of the 2005 KCSWDM. The design engineer shall address the applicable requirements on the final engineering plans and provide all necessary documents for implementation. The final recorded plat shall include all required covenants, easements, notes, and other details to implement the required BMP's for site development.

7. The proposed subdivision shall comply with the 1993 King County Road Standards (KCRS) including the following requirements:
 - a) 143rd Pl SE shall be improved at a minimum to the urban subcollector street standard. A temporary turnaround shall be provided at the northerly end, per the KCRS.
 - b) Tracts A and C shall be improved to the joint use driveway standard per Section 3.01 of the KCRS. These Tracts shall be owned and maintained by the Lots served.
 - c) Modifications to the above road conditions may be considered according to the variance provisions in Section 1.08 of the KCRS.
 - d) Road Variance L05V0101 is approved for this development. All conditions of approval for this variance shall be met prior to engineering plan approval.
8. All utilities within proposed rights-of-way must be included within a franchise approved by the King County Council prior to final plat recording.
9. The applicant or subsequent owner shall comply with King County Code 14.75, Mitigation Payment System (MPS), by paying the required MPS fee and administration fee as determined by the applicable fee ordinance. The applicant has the option to either: (1) pay the MPS fee at the final plat recording, or (2) pay the MPS fee at the time of building permit issuance. If the first option is chosen, the fee paid shall be the fee in effect at the time of plat application and a note shall be placed on the face of the plat that reads, "All fees required by King County Code 14.75, Mitigation Payment System (MPS), have been paid." If the second option is chosen, the fee paid shall be the amount in effect as of the date of building permit application.
10. Lots within this subdivision are subject to King County Code 21A.43, which imposes impact fees to fund school system improvements needed to serve new development. As a condition of final approval, fifty percent (50%) of the impact fees due for the plat shall be assessed and collected immediately prior to the recording, using the fee schedules in effect when the plat receives final approval. The balance of the assessed fee shall be allocated evenly to the dwelling units in the plat and shall be collected prior to building permit issuance.
11. Suitable recreation space shall be provided consistent with the requirements of K.C.C. 21A.14.180 and K.C.C. 21A. 14.190 (i.e., sport court[s], children's play equipment, picnic table[s], benches, etc.).
 - a. A detailed recreation space plan (i.e., location, area calculations, dimensions, landscape specs, equipment specs, etc.) shall be submitted for review and approval by DDES and King County Parks prior to or concurrent with the submittal of engineering plans.
 - b. A performance bond for recreation space improvements shall be posted prior to recording of the plat.
12. A homeowners' association or other workable organization shall be established to the satisfaction of DDES which provides for the ownership and continued maintenance of the recreation space tract.

13. Street trees shall be provided as follows (per KCRS 5.03 and K.C.C. 21A.16.050):
- a. Trees shall be planted at a rate of one tree for every 40 feet of frontage along all roads. Spacing may be modified to accommodate sight distance requirements for driveways and intersections.
 - b. Trees shall be located within the street right-of-way and planted in accordance with Drawing No. 5-009 of the 1993 King County Road Standards, unless King County Department of Transportation determines that trees should not be located in the street right-of-way.
 - c. If King County determines that the required street trees should not be located within the right-of-way, they shall be located no more than 20 feet from the street right-of-way line.
 - d. The trees shall be owned and maintained by the abutting lot owners *or* the homeowners association or other workable organization unless the county has adopted a maintenance program. Ownership and maintenance shall be noted on the face of the final recorded plat.
 - e. The species of trees shall be approved by DDES if located within the right-of-way, and shall not include poplar, cottonwood, soft maples, gum, any fruit-bearing trees, or any other tree or shrub whose roots are likely to obstruct sanitary or storm sewers, or that is not compatible with overhead utility lines.
 - f. The applicant shall submit a street tree plan and bond quantity sheet for review and approval by DDES prior to engineering plan approval.
 - g. The applicant shall contact Metro Service Planning at (206) 684-1622 to determine if 143rd Place SE is on a bus route. If 143rd Place SE is a bus route, the street tree plan shall also be reviewed by Metro.
 - h. The street trees must be installed and inspected, or a performance bond posted prior to recording of the plat. If a performance bond is posted, the street trees must be installed and inspected within one year of recording of the plat. At the time of inspection, if the trees are found to be installed per the approved plan, a maintenance bond must be submitted or the performance bond replaced with a maintenance bond, and held for one year. After one year, the maintenance bond may be released after DDES has completed a second inspection and determined that the trees have been kept healthy and thriving.
14. A landscape inspection fee shall also be submitted prior to plat recording. The inspection fee is subject to change based on the current county fees.
15. To implement K.C.C. 21A.38.230 which applies to the site, a detailed tree retention plan shall be submitted with the engineering plans for the subject plat. The tree retention plan (and engineering plans) shall be consistent with the requirements of K.C.C. 21A.38.230. No clearing of the subject property is permitted until the final tree retention plan is approved by LUSD. Flagging and temporary fencing of trees to be retained shall be provided, consistent with K.C.C. 21A.38.230.B.4. The placement of impervious surfaces, fill material, excavation work, or the storage of construction materials is prohibited within the fenced areas around preserved trees, except for grading work permitted pursuant to K.C.C. 21A.38.230.B.4.d.(2).

16. A note shall be placed on the final plat indicating that the trees shown to be retained on the tree retention plan shall be maintained by the future owners of the proposed lots, consistent with K.C.C. 21A.38.230.B.6. (Note that the tree retention plan shall be included as part of the final engineering plans for the subject plat.)

ORDERED December 10, 2007.

Peter T. Donahue
King County Hearing Examiner

TRANSMITTED December 10, 2007 to the following parties and interested persons of record:

Clyde Bacon
19436 - 146th Ave. SE
Renton WA 98058

Chris Brooker
19412 - 146th Ave. SE
Renton WA 98058

City of Renton
Attn: Greg Zimmerman
1055 S. Grady Way
Renton WA 98057

ESM Consulting Engineers
Attn: Eric LaBrie
33915 - 1st Way S., Ste 200
Federal Way WA 98003

Eugene Hardin
14413 SE 194th St.
Renton WA 98058

Robin Hipol
19344 - 142nd Pl. SE
Renton WA 98058

Ruth Ihlenfeldt
19232 - 146th Ave. SE
Renton WA 98058

Edward Hutson & R. Iwanski
9915 - 122nd St. E.
Puyallup WA 98373

Cliff & Sarah Langin
19240 - 146th Ave. SE
Renton WA 98058

William F. Loetscher
19424 - 144th Pl. SE
Renton WA 98058

Susan Petrossian
19327 - 144th Pl. SE
Renton WA 98058

Glenda Pizzichemi
19531 - 143rd Pl. SE
Renton WA 98058

Capt. Larry Rabel
Fire District. #37
24611 - 116th Ave. SE
Kent WA 98030

Harold & Sara Ravenscraft
6631 - 113th Pl. SE
Bellevue WA 98006

Ikumi Sakamoto
22025 - 129th Pl. SE
Kent WA 98031

Seattle KC Health Dept.
E. Dist. Environ. Health
14350 SE Eastgate Way
Bellevue WA 98007

Seattle Redevelopment LLC
Attn: Marc Rouso
P.O. Box 2566
Renton WA 98056

Teresa Torlai
19439 - 146th Ave. SE
Renton WA 98058

Ronald & Robin Walker
19327 - 143rd Pl. SE
Renton WA 98058

Thomas Williamson
14337 SE 196th Ct.
Renton WA 98058

Vincent & Marilyn Zeik
14320 SE 196th Ct.
Renton WA 98058

Kim Claussen
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Lisa Dinsmore
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Nick Gillen
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Shirley Goll
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Kristen Langley
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Chad Tibbits
DDES - LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Steve Townsend
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Larry West
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

Kelly Whiting
KC DOT, Rd. Svcs. Div.
MS KSC-TR-0231

Bruce Whittaker
DDES/LUSD
MS OAK-DE-0100

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

In order to appeal the decision of the Examiner, written notice of appeal must be filed with the Clerk of the King County Council with a fee of \$250.00 (check payable to King County Office of Finance) ***on or before December 24, 2007***. If a notice of appeal is filed, the original and six (6) copies of a written appeal statement specifying the basis for the appeal and argument in support of the appeal must be filed with the Clerk of the King County Council ***on or before December 31, 2007***. Appeal statements may refer only to facts contained in the hearing record; new facts may not be presented on appeal.

Filing requires actual delivery to the Office of the Clerk of the Council, Room 1025, King County Courthouse, 516 3rd Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104, prior to the close of business (4:30 p.m.) on the date due. Prior mailing is not sufficient if actual receipt by the Clerk does not occur within the applicable time period. The Examiner does not have authority to extend the time period unless the Office of the Clerk is not open on the specified closing date, in which event delivery prior to the close of business on the next business day is sufficient to meet the filing requirement.

If a written notice of appeal and filing fee are not filed within fourteen (14) calendar days of the date of this report, or if a written appeal statement and argument are not filed within twenty-one (21) calendar days of the date of this report, the decision of the hearing examiner contained herein shall be the final decision of King County without the need for further action by the Council.

MINUTES OF THE NOVEMBER 8, 2007, PUBLIC HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES FILE NO. L06P0017.

Peter T. Donahue was the Hearing Examiner in this matter. Participating in the hearing were Chad Tibbits, Bruce Whittaker and Kristen Langley, representing the Department; Eric LaBrie representing the Applicant, and Chris Brooker, Teresa Torlai, Ruth Ihlenfeldt, Sarah Langin, William Loetscher, Susan Petrossian, Glenda Pizzichemi, Marilyn & Vincent Zeik and Clyde Bacon.

The following Exhibits were offered and entered into the record:

- Exhibit No. 1 Department of Development and Environmental Services file no. L06P0017
- Exhibit No. 2 Department of Development and Environmental Services Preliminary Report, dated November 8, 2007
- Exhibit No. 3 Application for Land Use Permits received September 8, 2006
- Exhibit No. 4 SEPA checklist received September 8, 2006
- Exhibit No. 5 SEPA Determination of Non-Significance issued October 12, 2007

- Exhibit No. 6 Affidavit of Posting indicating a posting date of December 26, 2006
- Exhibit No. 7 Preliminary plat map received September 8, 2006
- Exhibit No. 8 Revised Level 1 Downstream Analysis prepared by ESM Consulting Engineers, received March 8, 2007
- Exhibit No. 9 L07V0021 King County Storm Water Drainage Manual (KCSWDM) Adjustment (Attachment 3 of the preliminary report to the Hearing Examiner)
- Exhibit No. 10 L07V0020 King County Road Variance (Attachment 2 of the preliminary report to the Hearing Examiner)
- Exhibit No. 11 Preliminary Road, Grading and Utility Plan prepared by ESM Consulting Engineers dated March 9, 2007
- Exhibit No. 12 Preliminary Landscape Design Plan prepared by ESM Consulting Engineers dated March 9, 2007
- Exhibit No. 13 Conceptual Neighborhood Circulation Plan prepared by ESM Consulting Engineers dated June 25, 2007
- Exhibit No. 14 Revised Pedestrian Walkway Conditions
- Exhibit No. 15 Letter dated September 7, 2006 prepared by ESM Consulting showing the applicant's intent to obtain 2 transfers of development rights credits to achieve the 16 lots proposed
- Exhibit No. 16 Page 5 of the Density and Dimensions worksheet dated October 24, 2007
- Exhibit No. 17 October 24, 2007 Notice of Appeal by Fire District No. 37
- Exhibit No. 18 November 1, 2007 Notice of Withdrawal of the Appeal by Fire District 37
- Exhibit No. 19 Neighborhood Traffic Safety from King County web site
- Exhibit No. 20 Graphs by Alan L. Pope & Associates, Inc. of King County New Construction-Residential & Condo Statistics and Auburn, Kent, Renton, South Seattle Listing Residential & Condos
- Exhibit No. 21 Seven letters from neighbors
- Exhibit No. 22 Four letters from neighbors